

# **Assassination Records Review Board Final Determination Notification**

---

AGENCY : CIA  
RECORD NUMBER : 104-10050-10002  
RECORD SERIES :  
AGENCY FILE NUMBER :

---

**July 20, 1995**

**Status of Document:**      Open in Full

**Number of releases of previously postponed information:** 3

**Reason for actions:**      The Review Board's decision was premised on several factors including: (a) the significant historical interest in the document in question inasmuch as it relates to core issues surrounding the CIA's records relating to Lee Harvey Oswald; (b) the absence of evidence that the release of the information would cause harm to the United States or to any individual.

The CIA did not appeal this action.

---

**Board Review Completed:** June 7, 1995

Date: 07/20/95  
Page: 1

JFK ASSASSINATION SYSTEM  
IDENTIFICATION FORM

-----  
AGENCY INFORMATION

AGENCY : CIA  
RECORD NUMBER : 104-10050-10002  
RECORD SERIES : JFK  
AGENCY FILE NUMBER : 80T01357A  
-----

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

ORIGINATOR : CIA  
FROM :  
TO :  
TITLE : DELAY IN SENDING THE FIRST CABLE ABOUT OSWALD.  
DATE : 00/00/  
PAGES : 1  
SUBJECTS : NAME TRACE  
MEXICO CABLE  
PHILLIPS, DAVE  
  
DOCUMENT TYPE : PAPER, TEXTUAL DOCUMENT  
CLASSIFICATION : SECRET  
RESTRICTIONS : OPEN IN FULL  
CURRENT STATUS : OPEN  
DATE OF LAST REVIEW : 07/06/93  
OPENING CRITERIA :  
COMMENTS : JFK3:F1 1993.07.06.16:17:21:930150: PART OF VOL I, COPY  
1 OF HELMS HEARING; COPIES 2-4 (BOX 3) AND COPIES 5-7  
AND 10 (BOX 4) ARE DUPLICATES AND ARE RETAINED IN HRG

REPRODUCTION

CIA HISTORICAL REVIEW PROGRAM  
RELEASE IN FULL 1995

PROHIBITED  
~~SECRET~~

SUBJECT: Delay in sending the first cable about  
OSWALD

1. Much has been written about the delay (by the Mexico Station) in sending the first cable requesting traces on the name Lee OSWALD. It was discussed in Dave Phillips book as a case of laziness on the part of the Soviet case officer (which in my view was unjust and unnecessary and indicates that Dave didn't know what he was talking about).

2. Normally, the Spanish transcript for the 1 October conversation would have been picked up on the morning of the 2nd of October. The Russian language portion would have gone to the Russian/English transcriber on the 3rd of October. The translation would have been returned the following day (4th) at which time, the Soviet case officer would have asked for the photographic coverage. That coverage would not have been in the station before the 7th since the film was still in the camera on the 3rd of October and it was picked up probably on the 4th, processed and passed to the Station on the next work day which would have been Monday 7 October.

3. Later the film was taken out of the camera every day but at that time, the film stayed in the camera until a full roll was completed which might take three or four days.

4. A name trace could have been requested on the basis of the name alone but that wasn't the way [Win Scott] ran that Station. [He wanted the photographic coverage tied in with the telephone coverage . . . sometimes there was a U.S. automobile license number.] It was also part of the "numbers game" of justifying a project by the number of dispatches, cables or reports produced.

0000151

~~SECRET~~

REPRODUCTION  
PROHIBITED

SECRET

(A)

D 01075